UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/551,993	10/04/2005	Hiroshi Tamagaki	279148US0PCT	6455
	7590 10/05/200 AK, MCCLELLAND	EXAMINER		
1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			MILLER, JR, JOSEPH ALBERT	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1792		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/05/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/551,993	TAMAGAKI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

		OCCENT WILEELY OF	1732	
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
THE F	REPLY FILED <u>21 September 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THI	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION I	FOR ALLOWANCE.	
; ; 1	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidaveal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, which p with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a I	laces the Request
a) [The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.		
b) [no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection.	
have b under 3 set fort may re	MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(ions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date een filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext87 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shin (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later duce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). CE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropriate extending name in the final Office action	ension fee n; or (2) as
	Γhe Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be	filed within two months of the	date of
1 1	Filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w IDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appea	
(The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, becan Salar They raise new issues that would require further constitution. They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)	nsideration and/or search (see NO		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially re		es for
((d) They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		ected claims.	
4. 🔲	The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-	324).
	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·	-	-
- - (For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) Inow the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-17. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		I be entered and an explanat	tion of
	AVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. 🔲 .	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
;	The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea , and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fails to pro ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).	
	The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation IEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attached.	
	The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.		n condition for allowance bec	ause:
	Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Tim	othy H Meeks/	/JOSEPH MILLER JR/		
	ervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1792	Examiner, Art Unit 1792		

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The requirement of instant claims 1 and 11 that the film is deposited in alpha alumina crystal structure has not been presented (versus 'formation' of such a layer).

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants amendment to require the deposition (versus the "formation") of a film in alpha alumina structure requires further search and consideration. Applicants argue that the present invention is carried out at a different pressure from that of the prior art, however, the pressure requirements noted are not claimed. Appliants also argue that Schaeffer and Warnes teach the deposition of the alpha alumina layer at a higher temperature and therefore the temperature range in dependent claims is not taught, but does not address the inclusion of Taira in the rejection. Taira is included as an alterantive method of producing the alpha alumina layer and therefore the teachings of Warnes regarding temperature are not applicable. The method of Taira is combined with that of Warnes as a low-temperature method of forming an alpha alumina film.

It is further noted that it is not clear that applicants amendment of claims 1 and 11 would overcome the comibnation of Taira with Warnes in view of Schaeffer - as Tair teaches the direct deposition of an alpha alumina film.